

**REMARKS**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-3 and 5-8 are now present in the application. Claim 4 has been cancelled. Claim 1 is independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner has indicated that dependent claims 4-8 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant gratefully appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter by the Examiner.

By the Amendment, independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate allowable claim 4, as described hereinbelow.

**Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hamburg, U.S. Patent 6,028,583. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As mentioned, independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate allowable claim 4. Although the intervening claim 3 is not incorporated in independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submit that Hamburg still fails to teach "the user input comprising a parameter T indicating a type of multivision filter, a parameter d indicating a relative distance between each layer and a parameter  $\theta$  indicating a rotation angle of the multivision filter" as recited in original claim 4 (now incorporated in claim 1.)

In particular, the Examiner has correctly acknowledged that Hamburg and the other cited references fail to teach the use of combination of parameter for defining a multi-vision effect (see Office Action, page 5, lines 8-9.) Therefore, it is believed that Hamburg fails to teach the above recitation as recited in amended claim 1. Since Hamburg fails to teach each and every limitation of amended independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims clearly define over the teachings of Hamburg. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state of the prior art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe McKinney Muncy, Registration No. 32,334 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Application No. 10/790,132  
Amendment dated September 29, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2006

Docket No.: 0941-0923P


Page 6 of 6

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 29, 2006

Respectfully submitted

By

*for*  Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

#43,368  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

*ls*